

MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF SANTA FE
FINANCE COMMITTEE

Santa Fe, New Mexico

June 2, 2003

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fe Finance Committee was called to order on this date at approximately 5:15 p.m. in City Hall Council Chambers. Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum, as follows:

Members Present:

Councilor Carol Robertson Lopez, Chair
Councilor Miguel M. Chavez
Councilor Karen Heldmeyer
Councilor Matthew E. Ortiz
Councilor Rebecca Wurzbarger

Members Excused:

None.

Other Governing Body Members Present:

Councilor Patti J. Bushee
Councilor David Coss

Staff Present:

Ms. Kathryn Raveling, Finance & Budget Division
Ms. Terrie Medina, Finance & Budget Division
Mr. Jim Romero, City Manager

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilor Heldmeyer moved approval of the Agenda, as published. Councilor Chavez seconded the motion, which passed 2-0 by voice vote. [Not present for this action: Councilor Ortiz and Councilor Wurzbarger.]

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Upon motion by Councilor Chavez, seconded by Councilor Heldmeyer, the following Consent Agenda, as amended, was approved 2-0 by voice vote. [Not present for this action: Councilor Ortiz and Councilor Wurzbarger.]

6. Bid Openings:
 - a) Bid No. 03/37/B — Traffic Calming Projects Cycle Two, Phase One, R.L. Leeder.
 1. Request for Approval of Budget Adjustments — Grant Fund/Project Fund.
 - b) Bid No. 03/61/B — Rain Barrels for Water Division; Home & Garden Innovations.
 1. Request for Approval of Purchase Agreement; Home & Garden Innovations.
 2. Request for Approval of Budget Adjustment — Water Enterprise Fund.
7. [Moved to Discussion Agenda by Councilor Heldmeyer.]
8. Request for Approval of Grant Award — Shelter Plus Care (SPC) Program; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.
 - a) Request for Approval of Budget Increase — Grant Fund.
 - b) Request for Approval of Professional Services Agreement — SPC Grant Administration; The Life Link/La Luz Shelter.
9. Request for Approval of License Agreement — Horse-drawn Carriage Services; Bear Creek Adventures, LC.
10. Request for Approval of Professional Services Agreement — Community Work Service Program Coordinator for Municipal Court; U.S. Hispanic Leadership Alliance, Inc.
 - a. Request for Approval of Professional Services Agreement — Computer Technical Services; Sage Industries, dba Andrew Lemert.
 - b. Request for Approval of Service Agreement — Monitoring Equipment and Services for Home Detention Program; Sentinel Offender Services, Inc.
11. [Moved to Discussion Agenda by Councilor Wurzbarger.]

12. Request for Approval of Amendment No. 2 to Professional Services Agreement — City Wide Source of Supply Improvement Program; Alpha Southwest, Inc.
 - a. Request for Approval of Budget Adjustment — Water Projects Fund.
13. Request for Approval of Amendment No. 2 to Professional Services Agreement — Security Services at Municipal Airport; Akal Security, Inc.
14. Request for Approval of professional Services Agreement — Paratransit Services for Santa Fe Ride Program (RFP No. 2003/20/P); Capital City Cab.
 - a. Request for Approval of Lease Agreement — Paratransit Vehicles; Capital City Cab.
15. Request for Approval of Professional Services Agreement — Rental of Uniforms for Transit Department (RFP No. 2003/27/P); Unifirst Corp.
16. Request for Approval of Sole Source Procurement and Professional Services Agreement — Operate Landlord/Tenant Hotline for Fair Housing Program; New Mexico Landlord/Tenant Hotline.
17. [Moved to Discussion Agenda by Councilor Wurzbarger.]

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 21, 2003

Upon motion by Councilor Chavez, seconded by Councilor Heldmeyer, the minutes of the April 21 meeting were approved 2-0 by voice vote, as submitted. [Not present for this action: Councilor Ortiz and Councilor Wurzbarger.]

April 22, 2003

Upon motion by Councilor Chavez, seconded by Councilor Heldmeyer, the minutes of the April 22 meeting were approved 2-0 by voice vote, as submitted. [Not present for this action: Councilor Ortiz and Councilor Wurzbarger.]

May 1, 2003

Upon motion by Councilor Heldmeyer, seconded by Councilor Chavez, the minutes of the May 1 meeting were approved 2-0 by voice vote, as submitted. [Not present for this action: Councilor Ortiz and Councilor Wurzburger.]

May 5, 2003

Upon motion by Councilor Chavez, seconded by Councilor Heldmeyer, the minutes of the May 5 meeting were approved 2-0 by voice vote, as submitted. [Not present for this action: Councilor Ortiz and Councilor Wurzburger.]

DISCUSSION AGENDA

Request for Approval of Purchase Option — Refuse Bags (Bid No. 02/47/B) for Solid Waste Division and City Internal Use; Resourceful Bag & Tag, Inc.

Councilor Heldmeyer stated that she has learned from Public Works director Mike Lujan that the bid the City received from the original contractor wasn't clear, but it accepted it anyway; and then when the City returned to the contractor to get more bags, the contractor stated that they could no longer honor the original price per box. She said the City Attorney has stated that the City has little recourse.

Councilor Heldmeyer stressed the need for clarity in the future so that this doesn't happen again.

Councilor Heldmeyer moved for approval. Councilor Chavez seconded the motion for discussion purposes.

Chair Lopez commented that it has been her impression that automated pickup service doesn't require the expensive trash bags the City uses in non-automated neighborhoods, because their only purpose is to help workers do their jobs more easily. She asked if the City foresees a time when people will simply have to buy their own bags. She questioned why people in automated neighborhoods should have to subsidize bags in non-automated neighborhoods.

Mr. Lujan responded that staff is evaluating that. He added that the City continues to encourage people with automated service to use the bags because loose debris in the containers can fly all over when the container is opened into the automated cab.

Chair Lopez said people could buy a roll of grocery store bags instead of relying on the City for its bags, and Mr. Lujan agreed.

Chair Lopez commented that she would prefer that route than seeing the City have to raise rates.

Councilor Wurzbarger asked what percentage of the population actually uses the City's bags, and Mr. Lujan responded that roughly 14,000 households (out of 23,000 households that are serviced) pick up the bags annually. He said staff is trying to determine what the rest of the community does for bags.

Ms. Raveling pointed out that some people don't want the City's big bags because they use smaller trash containers. She added that there are 104 bags per box, and for some families this supply may last two or three years.

Responding to questioning from Councilor Chavez, Purchasing Division supervisor Robert Rodarte said the City uses the bags internally for the Parks, GCCC and other areas — the individual departmental budgets pay the cost — and also supplies the Santa Fe Public Schools with approximately 1,800-2,000 bags, as well as Santa Fe County for their internal use. He said both of these entities go through the City to get a better price.

Mr. Rodarte said the City uses a 1.5 mil bag, one of the stronger bags available. He stated that a box of 104 costs the City \$8.58, whereas Sam's and other discount stores sell a 1.2 mil box of 90 bags for \$12.50. He stated that the bags are stitched on the sides rather than the bottom to accommodate Parks, which can put them over barrels. He said that Parks previously had to buy a bigger bag for certain barrels, but now they are using this particular bag, which is substantially cheaper.

Councilor Heldmeyer said she has suggested to Mr. Lujan that, at some point in the future, the City insert a questionnaire in the refuse bills to find out how many people pick up the bags.

Mr. Lujan noted that there is a back stock of bags because many people aren't picking them up, and that has resulted in a \$77,000 reduction in the FY 2003-04 operating supply budget.

Chair Lopez asked what kind of rate increase was being proposed, and Mr. Lujan responded that it was 18.35%. Chair Lopez asked how much that would go down if the bags were eliminated altogether, and Mr. Lujan responded that he would have to research that, but thought it would reduce the increase by perhaps 2%.

Ms. Raveling said staff would have figures to report to Council.

The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Request for Approval of Modification No. 001 to Collection Agreement — Buckman Direct Diversion Project; USDA Forest Service, Santa Fe National Forest.

Councilor Wurzbarger said she has asked the City Manager to respond to her question, prior to the next Council meeting, as to when this work will actually be performed.

Councilor Wurzbarger moved that this item go forward to the City Council. Councilor Heldmeyer seconded the motion.

Addressing the City Manager, Councilor Heldmeyer said that she would like to speak to someone prior to the Council meeting regarding site mitigation parameters.

The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

Request for Approval of Sole Source Procurement and Professional Services Agreement — Administrative and Policy Assistance Services for Fair Housing Program; Enterprise Foundation.

City HOME planner Alexandra Ladd was present with Enterprise Foundation representative Ed Rosenthal.

Ms. Ladd distributed copies of a Roundtable Financial Report prepared by the Santa Fe Community Housing Trust. *[Submitted herewith as Exhibit "A."]*

Responding to questioning from Councilor Wurzbarger, Ms. Ladd said the current balance in the fund reflects unallocated County money and unallocated City and Other. She stated that no money has been allocated in the past year because the RFP process is not triggered until the fund reaches \$50,000, which happened only recently.

Mr. Rosenthal explained that there are two funds, one that can only be used within the city limits, and the other only within the county. He said \$108,000 can be used in the city, and only \$5,000 within the county. He stated that the City has indicated it does not want its funds to be used within the county and vice versa.

Mr. Rosenthal said RFPs were issued when the fund reached \$50,000, which was about two months ago; since then, the fund has built up to about \$100,000. He stated that there are four responses totaling \$230,000+. He said \$100,000 of \$108,000 has been allocated, however, so the fund is oversubscribed.

Mr. Rosenthal stated that loan approval committee will meet next week and make recommendations. He said the committee consists of members of the Roundtable who cannot benefit from the fund, i.e., the City, the Enterprise Foundation, and Tierra Contenta.

Responding to other questions from Councilor Wurzburger, Mr. Rosenthal said the Roundtable's obvious goal is to produce more affordable housing, but over the last three or four years they have produced less housing annually than they would like. He noted that most of the affordable housing development in the city has been done in Tierra Contenta. He stated that the market is difficult because land costs are high; and in fact the \$100,000 available will cover only four new units, which is the proposal submitted by Habitat, and the rest of the money is for soft second mortgages (10 for NHS and 10 for SFCHT), and another amount for renovation of existing transitional housing by St. Elizabeth Shelter.

Councilor Wurzburger observed that the City is directly contributing \$113,000 to the community for affordable housing, is spending \$45,000 on The Enterprise Foundation contract, and is creating just a few affordable units.

Ms. Ladd said it was important to consider that The Enterprise Foundation does a lot more than assist with the Roundtable. She referred to a summary of accomplishments in the packet, reflecting that The Enterprise Foundation has brought in thousands of dollars in resources into the community as well as providing valuable technical assistance to the nonprofits to help them access other sources.

Ms. Ladd further clarified for Councilor Wurzburger that the \$100,000 is used by the nonprofits to capitalize their resources to bring in other money and resources, so it would be difficult to determine exactly how much the original \$100,000 could buy in affordable units.

Mr. Rosenthal added that the \$1.9 million allocated since inception has resulted in 184 affordable units.

Councilor Wurzburger moved for approval. Councilor Ortiz seconded the motion.

Chair Lopez questioned the justification for sole source procurement in this instance. She said "sole source" means there is no one else that can perform this service, and asked if the City made a good faith effort to ensure that in accordance with the Procurement Code.

Ms. Raveling responded that the City relies on the departments on these kinds of services; and as mentioned in staff's memorandum, this has been a sole source for a number of years. She commented that there is some usefulness in having continuity in such services, but there is also always an option to issue an RFP.

Councilor Heldmeyer asked Ms. Ladd if staff asked other affordable housing nonprofits if they would be interested in taking on the duties in this contract, and Ms. Ladd responded that none of the nonprofits is a technical assistance provider; rather, they are all service providers. She said The Enterprise Foundation “represents a huge array of different kinds of community development and housing development, and is linked in with lots of different federal funding sources as well as private funds *et cetera*.”

Councilor Heldmeyer observed that many of those things didn’t appear in the professional services agreement.

Councilor Heldmeyer said the agreement was confusing to read because a section refers to “administering the loan fund,” and later it refers to the affordable housing trust fund and the loan fund, which are two separate funds.

Ms. Ladd responded that this is the same fund. She said there used to be a pre-development loan fund component of it, and she thought this a typographical error (old language that should have been removed).

Councilor Heldmeyer asked what happened to the loan fund, and was the money ever paid back.

Mr. Rosenthal responded that the pre-development loan fund was previously funded through McCune, but there is no money left in there, but it could have funding at some point in the future.

Councilor Heldmeyer moved an amendment that the language be cleaned up to really reflect what the contractor is going to do and what the contractor is expected to do.

The amendment was accepted as friendly.

Chair Lopez noted that other providers could do various aspects of the Scope of Services. She cited the following language: “Developing periodic updates of the Affordable Housing Strategic Plan, developing funding approaches, and administering the loan fund.”

Chair Lopez asked that the City Attorney be asked to clarify whether or not this is appropriate as a sole source and, if it is, to sign off on it.

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote.

**Request for Approval of Proposed Revisions to City of Santa Fe
Purchasing Manual — Section 15.4 Resident and Local Preference.**

Ms. Raveling called the Committee's attention to proposed amendments to the local preference section in the City purchasing manual.

Ms. Raveling noted language specifying that preferences shall not apply for goods or services over \$1 million. She stated that this language is in the manual because, notwithstanding the Council's desire to support local vendors, it also has a fiscal responsibility in terms of where it wants to draw the line on support.

Ms. Raveling said the Finance Committee discussed doing away with that limitation at the last meeting, but still limiting the preference to \$50,000, which would amount to 5% from the City.

Ms. Raveling said that, in response to Councilor Heldmeyer's request that the City try to do a little more for local preference, she developed several scenarios and worked on the language, and would now propose giving an additional local preference up to \$100,000, but not putting it in competition with resident preference. She said that would mean that, if the City had an out-of-state bidder and someone local with a preference, the difference could go up to \$100,000 and the City could then award to the local preference.

Ms. Raveling said there are problems with making local preference compete with resident preference, because it essentially becomes a 10% preference, which could result in Albuquerque vendors simply not bidding on City projects.

Ms. Raveling distributed a page with four scenarios to illustrate this. *[Submitted herewith as Exhibit "B."]*

Ms. Raveling described the scenario that instigated this change. She said a Colorado firm and a resident preference both submitted bids on a \$5 million contract, with the resident preference bidding \$7,000 higher. She said the proposed language will have the difference apply up to \$50,000 — so the resident bidder would have received the award under that scenario.

Councilor Heldmeyer said there is still the problem of a local company coming in just a smidgeon over an Albuquerque company, because they would lose.

Ms. Raveling said the only way to resolve that issue is to say local preference is 10% — and while that would make it a lot easier, the City will not receive many bids from Albuquerque.

Councilor Heldmeyer remarked that this was becoming more complicated than expected.

Councilor Heldmeyer moved to bring this back to the next meeting with direction to the Committee members to submit other scenarios in the interim to Ms. Raveling for review. Councilor Wurzbarger seconded the motion, which passed 4-0 by voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Request for Concept Approval of an Ordinance Amending Various Sections of Chapter 5 SFCC Regarding Animal Control Regulations. (Councilor Coss)

A. Request for Approval of a Resolution Establishing Mandatory Licensing and Permit Fees, Fines and Penalties for Violations and Other Charges Relating to Animal Control.

Public Safety Committee vice chairman Michael Trujillo stated that it has been a long time since the animal control ordinance has been reviewed; and when Animal Control staff appeared before the Public Safety Committee a few weeks ago, they asked that fees be increased to cover various needs. He said those fees would go for education of Animal Control officers, among other things.

Mr. Trujillo stated that the Public Safety Committee is also proposing that the number of pets per household be limited and that there be a \$200 fee for breeding animals. He said this would also allow inspections of facilities for breeding.

Mr. Trujillo said there is the misimpression that vaccinating one's pet means the pet is automatically licensed to the City.

Responding to questioning from Chair Lopez, Animal Control director Pat Alano said the City sold 2,800 dog licenses last year — about 10% of the actual number of dogs in the city — that brought in revenues of about \$12,000 to \$14,000.

Mr. Alano also stated that he did a study by calling local vets in Santa Fe to find out how many dogs were actually vaccinated in the city, and the total he received from 11 vets was about 13,000. He said he also calculated at that time that there were 30,000 to 40,000 dogs in the city.

Mr. Alano said he has developed plans to increase compliance and consequently revenues into Animal Control; with those funds, they would print up signs to go in every vet's office, groomer's office, pet shop, etc. He said the sign would say that all dogs and cats over three months must be vaccinated against rabies and licensed

through the City. He said they could also leave mail-in forms with vets, etc. He stated that the Shelter now licenses all animals that are adopted, and buys the licenses for \$3 each. He said he would like to look into having the Shelter license animals, with the City selling them the licenses at a reduced cost.

Chair Lopez said she thought even more could be done, and suggested that the City bring in some expertise to help Animal Control develop a marketing campaign.

Councilor Ortiz suggested that vets be allowed to license animals by being paid a premium for the service — for instance, they pay the City \$3 for a license and charge their clients \$6 and keep the difference.

Mr. Alano stated that, based on his discussions with several vets, they don't have the time or manpower to do that, and do not want to be involved because they do not see it as a health issue.

Councilor Bushee commented that people need to be educated on the benefits of having licensed pets, or else noncompliance will continue as before. She pointed out to Mr. Alano that he needs to make a very good case for raising the fees.

Addressing her biggest concern about the ordinance changes, Councilor Bushee expressed concern that more pets brought into the shelter will be euthanized because their owners will not want to pay the increased fees.

Mr. Alano said one point of having a license is to track down the owner if their pet is turned into the shelter, lost or injured. He said the law states that a pet can be either adopted out or euthanized after three days at the shelter. He stated that the other point is to make sure animals are vaccinated against rabies —New Mexico hasn't had a case of rabies for 15-20 years because so many animals are vaccinated.

Mr. Trujillo stated that the spay-neuter van is often parked. He said perhaps the City could assist Animal Control in developing a program where the van could go into neighborhoods and license animals.

Councilor Bushee asked if the license could go along with the rabies vaccination, which is now required every three years, and Mr. Trujillo responded that the City would lose track of people.

Councilor Bushee asked if the City could send out notices reminding people that it is time to renew their pet license, just as it does with business licenses.

Mr. Trujillo responded that the bottom line is money to do that. He said Councilors would have to commit to dedicate a certain amount of money to Animal Control to allow this effort and other efforts.

Councilor Bushee suggested that staff investigate the cost of sending out notices to pet owners.

Mr. Alano clarified that State law requires rabies vaccinations for dogs, cats and ferrets, and licensing for dogs and cats only.

Mr. Alano also stated that licensing a pet every three years would not be practical because so many people change their phone numbers and addresses more often than that.

Councilor Heldmeyer stated that, once an animal is signed up, Animal Control has to have a system to notify people about renewal. She said many people believe that the rabies tag is in fact the license.

Addressing the reluctance of vets to get involved in this process, Councilor Heldmeyer wondered how much extra effort it would take to hand out a form at the vet's office that says, "You're supposed to get your animal registered, and here's how to do it." She suggested that vets might need a little more persuasion to do that.

Councilor Heldmeyer said some people are upset about the proposed limitation of four dogs and cats, wanting to know what they should do with their fifth animal.

Councilor Heldmeyer stated that other people are upset over the proposed requirement that breeders require certification through a nationally recognized animal breeding organization. She said dog owners have pointed out to her that some AKC breeders are very irresponsible because they are trying to make a lot of money at it. She suggested that, if the City is saying it would prefer people not breed animals, it could provide disincentives for that.

Councilor Heldmeyer said there are also some potential problems with the ordinance, e.g., animals are not allowed on the Plaza during certain festivals, including Fiesta, which would seem to include the Pet Parade. She said the ordinance also states that dogs and cats that are not service animals will not be allowed on premises of schools — however, some preschools and private schools have dogs and cats that stay on the premises as the school pet, and sometimes they have "pet day."

Councilor Heldmeyer stressed the importance of making compliance with the ordinance as easy and painless as possible.

Councilor Wurzbarger pointed out that the mission of the ordinance — protection — is not reflected in its title, which focuses on control. She said she would encourage staff to rename the ordinance.

Councilor Wurzbarger said schools would seem to be a logical place to do some kind of public education “get your pet registered” program, stressing that the reason for registering one’s pet is to protect it, and why.

Councilor Wurzbarger stated that, in her neighborhood, many families walk to school with their pet to meet their children, which could be illegal under the proposed ordinance change.

Chair Lopez said this ordinance was not ready to sent to the Council, as clearly there was more work to do on it. She recommended that a subcommittee be formed through the Public Safety Committee to come up with changes to then bring back to the Public Works and Finance committees.

Councilor Coss pointed out that there are ten vets in town, and they wouldn’t be in business if so many people didn’t have dogs and cats. He commented, “I think they need to help us with this program.”

Councilor Coss commented that perhaps license renewals should be moved to three-year intervals to coincide with vaccinations, since that would probably increase the number of licensed pets and increase revenues to Animal Control.

Councilor Coss said his kids are grown now, but when they were younger he never allowed them to run in the parks “because the parks were full of dog feces, and they still are, and I’m tired of it. And so I’m looking for more penalties, more education, and more enforcement on that level, because people have to learn to take care of their animals.”

Councilor Coss asked that the Council hearing on this ordinance be deferred to the end of the summer to allow time to work on it.

Public Comment

Animal Shelter director Kate Rindy stated that, based on her many years of experience in this field, “on balance, this is a very progressive and very good ordinance.”

Ms. Rindy agreed with remarks by Councilor Wurzbarger that the ordinance should also emphasize protection, because the role of the City is to control the animals for the protection of the public.

Ms. Rindy pointed out that the number of animals in Santa Fe city limits, based on national estimates of 2.3 to 2.4 per household, is many more than 30,000-40,000,

as mentioned by Mr. Alano. She said the Shelter takes in 6,000 to 7,000 animals annually.

Ms. Rindy said the problem with the licensing situation is that people not only don't understand that they are supposed to license their pets, but many people don't have much money to take care of their animals. She said the Shelter tries to help those people by subsidizing all adoptions, including providing rabies vaccinations and issuing licenses.

Ms. Rindy said, "I think the work that needs to be done before you consider this for final passage is, how do we afford the financial burden so that we can both hold people more responsible, but make it user friendly and help them to do it in a way that doesn't get them to say, 'well, just keep my dog, I'll go get me another one.' " She said this is already happening with the existing fee structure, and that the Shelter is very concerned that the euthanasia rate will quickly go up under the proposed amendments.

As a solution, Ms. Rindy suggested that the City consider a cooperative program with the Animal Shelter, vets and the community to see what can be done to promote responsible pet ownership.

Ms. Rindy said the spay-neuter van goes around doing free spaying and neutering in rural New Mexico, and suggested that it be made available within the city limits, particularly during the winter months, when it sits idle. She said the van could go into different neighborhoods each week, promoting vaccinations, licensing, etc. She said perhaps the vets could be persuaded to offer this at discounted fees.

This concluded public comment.

Following discussion, the Committee agreed that the public hearing would take place at the first Council meeting in September.

The following persons agreed to serve on the Public Safety subcommittee: Councilor Heldmeyer; Councilor Coss; Councilor Bushee; Mr. Alano; Ms. Rindy, and Mr. Trujillo. Chair Lopez suggested that one or two veterinarians be asked to serve as well.

Councilor Wurzbarger so moved. Councilor Ortiz seconded the motion, which passed 4-0 by voice vote.

[Chair Lopez excused herself from the proceedings and turned the gavel over to Councilor Ortiz.]

**Request for Approval to Publish Notice of Public Hearing on
July 9, 2003, of an Ordinance Repealing Section 14-9.3 SFCC 1987
and Creating a New Section 14-8.14 Relating to Impact Fees, and
Amending Section 14-12 SFCC 1987 Relating to Definitions.
(Councilor Bushee, Councilor Chavez)**

City Planning director Reed Liming distributed a revised fee schedule to replace the one in the committee packet. *[Submitted with these minutes as Exhibit "C."]* He said the revised fee schedule has the effect of reducing residential fees by about 10% across the board and reducing nonresidential fees by 5-10% across the board. He explained that staff and the consultant had underestimated, in the CIP tables, the amount of gross receipts revenue bond money put toward roads and parks.

Councilor Bushee commented that she was disappointed that there was no apparent interest from the County in levying impact fees. She said she hoped the Council representatives on the RPA would bring that up as an issue in terms of City-County cooperation, based on the fact that the majority of the growth is outside city limits and all kinds of city services include that population.

Councilor Heldmeyer moved for approval. Councilor Wurzburger seconded the motion for discussion purposes.

Councilor Wurzburger asked if she understood correctly that the new schedule will add at least \$1,922 to a median priced house across the board, which is approximately four times more than someone would pay today; and that the fees will double, triple or quadruple in other categories.

Mr. Liming responded that this was correct, and it can be assumed that those fees will be passed through to the price of the house.

Councilor Wurzburger commented that this will affect about 90% of the building in Santa Fe.

Mr. Liming explained that state law (and this ordinance) contains a provision that, if a development plan or subdivision plat has received approval within the last four years, it will pay impact fees at the fee schedule in place at the time of approval.

Councilor Wurzburger observed that was no difference in application of these fees between someone who is building 100 houses and someone who is building their own home.

Councilor Wurzburger expressed concern about timing. She said many people graduating from college right now cannot find jobs, which is a national economy indicator that could eventually impact Santa Fe.

Councilor Ortiz asked Mr. Liming to include cost comparisons for building permit fees in Las Cruces and Albuquerque, since the City is also proposing building permit fee increases at about the same time, and people should be able to assess the overall financial impact. He also asked for a comparison between impact fees the City currently assesses for roads and those being proposed.

Councilor Wurzbarger asked Mr. Liming to include retrofit fees as well as part of the overall financial impact.

Councilor Wurzbarger commented that she was assuming that the impact fees for roads would not totally pay the cost of a road, and that the community will have to pay a percentage of the total cost. She asked Mr. Liming to determine, prior to Council, what that percentage might be.

Councilor Bushee said infill projects on older lots in established neighborhoods would seem to present less of a burden, since the roads, parks and other infrastructure are already in place. She asked Mr. Liming if there is a formula to calculate that.

Responding to a request of Councilor Bushee, Mr. Liming said he would try to estimate the approval dates of active subdivisions in the city and return with a summary sheet giving an idea of what percent are in subdivisions that are less than four years old, how many lots there are, and subdivisions that are active and were approved more than four years ago, and how many lots that would be.

The motion passed 4-0 by voice vote. [Chair Lopez was not present for this action.]

MATTERS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Councilor Ortiz asked for a report from staff on when the City could go to automation for all City billing, either by direct deposit or online.

ADJOURN

Its business completed, the Committee adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Accepted by:

Councilor Carol Robertson Lopez, Chair

Reviewed by:

Kathryn Raveling, Finance Director

Submitted by:

Judith S. Beatty, Recorder

